

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

LEDALE NATHAN,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Case No. 1:19-CV-152 JSD
	)	
DAVID VANDERGRIFF, Potosi	)	
Correctional Center,	)	
	)	
and	)	
	)	
ANDREW BAILEY, Missouri Attorney	)	
General,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

On October 28, 2024, Petitioner filed a Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment, or In the Alternative for a Certificate of Appealability (“Motion”; ECF No. 75). Petitioner filed his Motion pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e).

Rule 59(e) motions “serve the limited function of correcting ‘manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence.’” *United States v. Metro St. Louis Sewer Dist.*, 440 F.3d 930, 933 (8th Cir. 2006); *Aguilar v. United States*, No. 4:11-CR-00190 BSM, 2018 WL 11301050, at \*1 (E.D. Ark. Dec. 7, 2018), *aff’d*, No. 18-3699, 2019 WL 11890662 (8th Cir. May 9, 2019). In his motion for reconsideration, Petitioner presents no new arguments or facts, nor has he alleged any new circumstances that justify reconsideration. Rather, Petitioner merely reargues claims previously attended to and discounted by this Court. Because Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of a denial of a federal constitutional right, the Court again denies a certificate of appealability. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); *Tiedeman v. Benson*, 122 F.3d 518, 522 (8th Cir. 1997).

For the reasons set forth above,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Petitioner's Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment, or In the Alternative for a Certificate of Appealability (ECF No. 75) is **DENIED**.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JOSEPH S. DUEKER  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Dated this 17<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2024.